

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

**NOTICE OF DOCUMENT DISCREPANCIES**

**FILED**

08 APR 10 PM 1:30

*This space for  
Clerk's Office File Stamp*

U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

TO: ☐ U. S. DISTRICT JUDGE / ☐ U. S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE Whelan 994  
FROM: C Puttmann, Deputy Clerk RECEIVED DATE: 4/8/2008 DEPUTY  
CASE NO.: 07cr3188 W DOCUMENT FILED BY: Defendant  
CASE TITLE: USA v. Lopez-Ojeda  
DOCUMENT ENTITLED: Defendant's Objections to the Court's Imposition of Probation/Supervised

Upon the submission of the attached document(s), the following discrepancies are noted:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Local Rule	Discrepancy
<input type="checkbox"/> 5.1	Missing time and date on motion and/or supporting documentation
<input type="checkbox"/> 5.3	Document illegible or submitted on thermal facsimile paper
<input type="checkbox"/> 5.4	<b>Document not filed electronically. Notice of Noncompliance already issued.</b>
<input type="checkbox"/> 7.1 or 47.1	Date noticed for hearing not in compliance with rules/Document(s) are not timely
<input type="checkbox"/> 7.1 or 47.1	Lacking memorandum of points and authorities in support as a separate document
<input type="checkbox"/> 7.1 or 47.1	Briefs or memoranda exceed length restrictions
<input type="checkbox"/> 7.1	Missing table of contents
<input type="checkbox"/> 15.1	Amended pleading not complete in itself
<input type="checkbox"/> 30.1	Depositions not accepted absent a court order
<input type="checkbox"/>	Supplemental documents require court order
<input type="checkbox"/>	Default Judgment in sum certain includes calculated interest
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<u>OTHER: Case closed per Judgment of 12/5/2007</u>

Date forwarded: 4/9/2008

**ORDER OF THE JUDGE / MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

**IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:**

- ☐ The document is to be filed nunc pro tunc to date received.
- ☒ The document is NOT to be filed, but instead REJECTED. and it is ORDERED that the Clerk serve a copy of this order on all parties.

Rejected document to be returned to pro se or inmate? ☐ Yes. Court Copy retained by chambers ☐

Counsel is advised that any further failure to comply with the Local Rules may lead to penalties pursuant to Local Rule 83.1

CHAMBERS OF: Whelan

Dated: 4/10/08  
cc: All Parties

By: [Signature]

**REJECTED**

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA.**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, )  
Plaintiff, )

vs. )

LOPEZ-OJEDA, CUAUHTEMOC, )  
Defendant. )

Case Number: CR 03-014-01-PHX-FJM.

**DEFENDANT'S OBJECTIONS TO THE  
COURT'S IMPOSITION OF  
PROBATION / SUPERVISED RELEASE.**

**(A).- STATEMENT OF THE ISSUES PRESENTED**

- 1.-Whether the District Court has Jurisdiction to revoke Defendant's Supervise Release term.
- 2.-Whether Supervised Release would be properly revoke when the Government "did not" provide with the conditions that Mr.Lopez-Ojeda,Cuauhtemoc is charged with violating.
- 3.-Whether the imposition of Probation / Supervise Release is proper when the relevant Title 8 U.S.C. § 1326 does not mandate the imposition of that separate sentence.

Lopez-Ojeda,Cuauhtemoc.  
Reg. No.:60873-208.  
California City Correctional Center  
P.O. Box 2590  
California City, CA 93504

**IN PROPRIA PERSONA**